

13. VIEW TERRACE STOPPING – PEDESTRIAN AND TRAFFIC SAFETY CONCERNS PROPOSAL

RR 10314

Officer responsible City Streets Manager	Author Jeff Owen, Area Engineer
Corporate Plan Output: Neighbourhood Improvements 9.5 text 67	

The purpose of this report is to seek the Committee's views as to which option should be selected for public consultation to address submitters concerns on the previous road stopping of View Terrace.

The reason the Committee is considering this is that the recommendation made by the View Terrace Road Stopping Resource Management Hearings Panel. The Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board has also received this report at its August meeting. At that meeting the Board decided that:

- (a) A Subcommittee be formed comprising Sue Wells, Lynda Carter and Ian Howell, assisted by Jeff Owen, Area Engineer, and Weng Kei Chen, Asset Policy Engineer.
- (b) The Subcommittee contact all the submitters and discuss options, with the objective being to ascertain a preferred option.
- (c) That Subcommittee report back with a recommendation to the Spreydon-Heathcote Community Board at its meeting to be held on 7 September 1999.

The concerns relating to pedestrian safety were also considered by the committee at its February 1999 meeting following a deputation by Mr Rod Whearty, 21 View Terrace. Mr Whearty sought an allocation of funding for safety works in View Terrace. Speed of traffic and a lack of pedestrian facilities were of concern to residents. At that meeting the Committee resolved to investigate the implementation of a speed limit on View Terrace and/or, alternatively, the provision of a footway adjacent to the road. The views of the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board will be sought.

BACKGROUND

In May 1990 initial concern was expressed over the safety of children and pedestrians on View Terrace from the Huntsbury Community Centre. A history outline is included in a previous report attached as Appendix 1. In July 1998 a road closure notice was publicly notified to stop a portion of View Terrace. A subsequent Road Stopping Hearing was held in November 1998. The Hearings Panel recommended that:

For the reasons given above, the Panel, is of the opinion that the road stopping at this point should not proceed and therefore recommends:

1. *That the issues of speed and safety on View Terrace be referred to the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board.*
2. *That the City Services Committee as a matter of urgency consider the current uses and potential uses of View Terrace taking into consideration the unsatisfactory nature of traffic management in View Terrace and the safety and welfare of people using the road.*

The full Report and Recommendations of the Hearings Panel is attached as Appendix 2. Following the Hearings Panel recommendations the City Streets Unit commissioned City Design to prepare a plan addressing the submitters concerns in an attempt to reach the best resolution of the problems raised.

PROPOSAL

Three main issues are seen as concerns from the submitters. They are:

1. The fact that vehicles and pedestrians must use the same road space on the steep narrow section of View Terrace from Ramahana Road to No.4 View Terrace. Down hill motorists using this section at speed.
2. The lack of a footpath from the intersection of View Terrace and Huntsbury Avenue running uphill to No.12 Huntsbury Avenue.
3. The difficult intersection of Huntsbury Ave and its slip road down to View Terrace adjacent to No.9 Huntsbury Avenue.

OPTION 1

Barrier on View Terrace

The original proposal to road stop a portion of View Terrace near No.4 and install a pedestrian style barrier would stop the motorists who use this section of the terrace as a short cut to the bottom of the hill. It has been suggested that these motorists live on the upper part of Huntsbury Avenue. There are only five properties having physical access off the narrow section of View Terrace. Installing a barrier at the top would mean these properties would have to be accessed from the bottom of hill at its intersection with Ramahana Road. This would mean the road would be used like a right of way with only minimal vehicle movements. Pedestrians would have a safer environment than at present. In my original report it was proposed to investigate the need for a turning head adjacent to No.2 View Terrace. The plan (Appendix 3) shows a hammerhead turning area to assist in vehicle turning without using private driveways. Little extra dig out is required as much of the area is already formed. To fully develop a hammerhead turning area it has been estimated \$36,500 would be required.

OPTION 2

Footpath on View Terrace

An alternative to restricting through traffic on the track is to construct a separate footpath over the whole length from Huntsbury Avenue down to Ramahana Road. A plan showing this option is Appendix 4. This would involve a 1.5 metre wide path separated from the roadway by a concrete kerb on the outside of the roadway. A safety fence and some retaining are also required. The footpath could be linked to the path discussed in option 2 if that was constructed. An estimate for this work is \$51,300. It is noted that the turning area as discussed in option 1 would not be required however minor driveway adjustment may be required.

If this alternative option is considered it must be emphasized that it will not stop vehicles travelling down the track at speed meeting vehicles travelling up on a one way roadway. This is part of the residents original concerns. Therefore in conjunction with this option making the roadway one way either up or down would need to be considered. A recent speed survey confirmed that the mean speed of vehicles is very low, 20km/hr. However this speed to a pedestrian may well be seen as excessive given the fact they must use the same road space as the vehicle.

OPTION 3

Footpath on Huntsbury Avenue

The lack of a footpath from View Terrace to No.12 Huntsbury Avenue is of concern. Numerous school children have been observed using this section of roadway. The plan attached (Appendix 3) shows a proposal to construct a footpath on the eastern side of the road. Adequate road reserve is available without land purchase. Various sections of the proposed footpath however do not meet the maximum grade of 8%, due to the nature of this hill area this can not be avoided. City Design have provided an estimate of \$30,000 for this work.

OPTION 4

Markings at Intersection on Huntsbury Avenue

The intersection of Huntsbury Avenue and the slip road down to View Terrace is tight for most turning movements. The submitters main concern is the lack of roadway width when turning left onto Huntsbury Avenue. One must travel over the white centre line even with the vehicle on full turning lock. From my own observations and vehicle turning trials by travelling further uphill before turning does help solve this problem. Little opportunity exists to widen the roadway due to limits imposed by its 20 metre boundary to boundary width. The plan attached (Appendix 3) proposes to add and reposition existing road markings to give better guidance to where a motorist should turn from. Part of these changes involves moving the centre line to provide a wider lane on the west side of Huntsbury Avenue. Banning parking near this intersection is vital to achieve this extra road space. This requires removing parking from outside numbers 7,9,11,16,12 and part of number 10 Huntsbury Avenue. A point to note is that it is not illegal to cross a white centre line as long as the way is clear. An estimate for this work is \$950.

SUMMARY

This report discusses various ways to address the residents and submitters concerns. For clarity the options are summarized below.

Option 1 - Barrier on View Terrace (see Appendix 3)

- Estimated cost \$36,500.
- Solves the issue of vehicles travelling down at speed mixing with pedestrians.
- Property owners with accesses of this section of View Terrace will access from the bottom of the hill.
- A turning area is required.

Option 2 - Footpath on View Terrace (see Appendix 4)

- Estimated cost \$51,300.
- Solves the issue of vehicles travelling down mixing with pedestrians.
- As the roadway is narrow making the road one way up or down should be considered. This was part of the residents original concerns.
- No turning area is required however minor driveway adjustment may be required.

Option 3 - Footpath on Huntsbury Ave (see Appendix 3)

- Estimated cost \$30,000.
- Solves the issue of vehicles and pedestrians using the same road space.
- Will provide a footpath from View Terrace to No.12 Huntsbury Ave.

Option 4 - Markings at Intersection on Huntsbury Ave (see Appendix 3)

- Estimated cost \$950.
- Helps solve turning problems by giving guidance to motorist of where to turn from on the roadway.
- Little opportunity exists to widen the roadway due to limits imposed by its 20 metre boundary to boundary width.

CONCLUSION

The objectors to the proposed previous 'road stopping' have raised many issues of concern. The main issues are discussed in the report. The plans presented address these issues although some are difficult to solve without major changes and financial commitment.

Either option 1 or option 2 along with options 3 & 4 should be pursued. The estimated cost by City Design for a barrier on View Terrace (option 1) is \$67,450. The estimated cost by City Design for a footpath on View Terrace (option 2) is \$82,250. The preferred option is the barrier across View Terrace, as this removes down hill vehicles conflicting with up hill vehicles. It is also the most cost effective solution. At present in the 5 Year Capital Expenditure Programme, no commitment has been made to funding this project.

To proceed with option 1 (including options 3 & 4) agreement with the objectors must be reached before the legal process of 'road stopping' can be concluded. Once this is achieved (about a seven month process) funding will have to be obtained for the construction of the project."

- Recommendation:**
1. That the information be received.
 2. That the Committee support for public consultation the proposal shown in Appendix 3.
 3. That funding be provided in the draft 2000/01 budget, following the conclusion of favourable consultation.

Deputy Chairman's

Recommendation: That the above recommendation be adopted.